NEW CHRISTIAN

JULY - OCT. 1958 (DOUBLE ISSUE) EDITED BY KENNETH LESLIE

GALYATETO STILETTO

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

and the

1956 HUNGARIAN COUNTER REVOLUTION

THE WAR AGAINST THE PEOPLE

By Louise Harding

SOME BURNING QUESTIONS FOR U.S.

By Judge Edward P. Totten

BOOK NOTICES

Dyson Carter's "The Big Brainwash"

Scott and Helen Nearing's "Socialists Around the World"

E. H. Visiak's "The Portent of Milton"

Vol. XIII, Nos. 4 and 5 30 cents

GALYATETO STILETTO

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND THE 1956 COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN HUNGARY

In 1952 we saluted the just-passed Conference on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches and the coming Evanston conference in a piece called *Anti-Christ in the Sanctuary.*

The Hungarians and Czechs had been calling on their churches to repent. But repent of what? Their close connection with exploitative capitalism and feudalism. Their cosiness with the fascist Horthy.

The World Council also called for repentance but not for any such crucial issue. Simply for disunity. A wolf pack has unity.

At the Lund conference on Faith and Order Dr. Hromadka said it was depressing to note that the churches in socialist countries contradicted those in capitalist countries on all the momentous problems of our time, Korea, China, Nato, Communism, and so on. The church, he said, "must struggle with the Anti-Christ in her own sanctuary."

In the same issue (Protestant, IX, 3, 1952) we suggested that *the way to get the issue properly stated would be for Christian Chinese and North Koreans to come before the full Assembly of the World Council of Churches bringing with them a full presentation of their case which they were not permitted to bring before the United Nations Organization, films, documents, pictures of North Korea before and after the World Council-blessed visitation of UN police forces, living human documents too, broiled, grilled, in all their grotesque horror.* Not nice to say? But far far less nice to experience? *Evidence also should be submitted bearing on the question of the UN crime of bacterial genocide.*

Only thus can the Christian Church in the world today begin to understand itself, begin to see itself as it really is . . .

The church of Christ has often been attacked both from within and without. But never has it put itself in such a sore place as today, underwriting a lie, accessory to a crime without parallel in history. Never before has it crawled on its belly after such a foul-mouthed hypocrite, never has it sold itself so dirt-cheap, currying the contemptuous favor of those who batten on the sweat of the multitudes and of those who glory in the name of killers. It is difficult for us to understand the monumental patience and deep maturity of the Hungarians and Czechs on any other premise than that they realize they are dealing with a very low form of spiritual immaturity when they are dealing with Western Christendom . . .

Churches Admit Communism Leads Them:

The Hungarians took the World Council sharply to task for *pretending* in the Faith and Order Report that their concern for race and class problems *originated within the church* whereas *"It is really a matter of acting on a very human consideration, namely on the opinion of the Theological Commission that the*

churches, with regard to these issues, are lagging behind Communism."

We have underlined this exposure of the low competitive motivation (we disagree with the Hungarian use of "human" as the proper epithet here) of the writers of the Report. *This competing with Communism is a dead give-away to the whole bankrupt propaganda of anti-Communism.* The churches are always saying "We must alleviate suffering and poverty. We have made token stabs and dabs at it before. Now we must really go at it in earnest. Why? Because the Communists just thrive on it ! Clean it all up and there'll be nothing for the Communists to thrive on."

As if to say Christ thrived on the suffering and poverty of his people! Is it the thriving of the Communists that offends the churches? Or is it rather the *assuaging* of suffering by the Communists that *touches an old dormant nerve of the church* reminding it that its only *true* life is *in that assuaging.* If the church were a church-alive *it would* gladly *welcome* and assist *this work rather than look at it out of jealous and envious eyes.*

When Christ has been cast out of his church it is not His church any more. When class or race discrimination enter His church He walks out. Now since it is actually the case that these discriminations are the practical rule in the Western church (never mind what is *said* about it; it is what is *done* that matters in this day of judgment) therefore it would seem fair to say that the Western Church, as it presents itself to the world, really doesn't exist. What does exist is an institution of anti-Christ. But the best way to struggle with the anti-Christ is to walk away. "Lead us not into temptation." Wherever the cosmic spirit of Christ's tenderness broods, *there is the Sanctuary.*

There is a church. The church doesn't die. Wherever people love each other, plan and work to change the world into a world of friendly mutuality *there is the church.* Today members of this church are called conspirators and are suffering persecution at the hands of the same priests and potentates who persecuted the Carpenter and the Fisherman and the Tentmaker. And the Spirit which drove those early ones to merge their personal destinies in the destiny of the human race is today driving a saint like Elizabeth Gurley Flynn to do likewise.

In 1952 we said and we repeat today. "We do not believe in the good faith of the World Council of Churches. There have been undoubtedly, and still are, many individuals in the World Council even in its top committees who are of good faith. But it is impossible for us to believe that there have not been individuals in the World Council who have been, whether conscious, unconscious, or half conscious of their own motives, pursuing a definite plan for the World Council. These individuals yearn for bigness. They yearn for power. They want the Middle Ages with sanitation, push buttons and limousines. This desire did not originate with them. It originated in those who found themselves in control of the United States power-complex after World

War II and who saw what they thought was an opportunity to control the business of the world and to make it pay tribute to them. The only real obstacle to their ambition was the Soviet Union. To remove this obstacle they felt compelled to cultivate animosity among their people and among Western Europeans against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

"It was right here that the World Council became useful to them, and as has been pointed out by the Hungarians, has been used by them to help prepare the people of the West and put them in the proper frame of mind for war.

"The question that keeps recurring to us is: how can the Hungarians (and we shall let them symbolize all Eastern churches) sit down and hold communion with a group of men who serve not the God of peace but the god of war?!"

In 1951 the Hungarian section of the World Council of Churches admonished the parent body for having, in its Bievres declaration on the International situation, maintained its mistaken line at Toronto, failed to urge China's admission to the UN, and in its paragraphs on the evils of re-armament failed to mention the issue of Germany's re-armament. The Hungarians also say: "It is obvious that the UN is exerting a great influence on your thinking and it is presumable that likewise also you may have ways and means to influence the UN." They urge that such influence be used to rectify the presence in the Security Council of a US satellite in place of China, leaving 600 million people unrepresented in that body.

To this date (Sept. 1958) the admonishments (and they have been numerous) have been of no effect.

As late as May 1958 the Hungarian Ecumenical Council has received no explanations or apologies for the Galyateto Stiletto. They are too polite to name it thus. But they do imply that this silence is eloquent of guilt. Moreover, they are compelled to "state with regret that the World Council of Churches has failed to apply any of the instruments at its disposal to fight the cold war that so decisively separates and sets against one another the peoples of the world.

The record of failure and betrayal made by the World Council of Churches is sufficient to make plain that it is essentially anti-Christian.

To maintain connection with it is to share its character. If the churches in socialist countries stay in it they will not only assist its reactionary work but if they remain in it permanently they will cut themselves off from the genuine stream of Christian development. They have a job to do, a terribly difficult job, in their own hands. How can they do this while soiling their hands with those who aid the enemies of socialism?

This whole ecumenical movement (never a popular movement) has been a trap. It has prevented the "socialist" churches from finding and building their place in a society whose way of life accords with their gospel.

In a recent issue (Mar.-Apr. 1958) we told some of the story of the World Council's crime in aiding and abetting a Hapsburg counter-revolution in Hungary. Our witness was Bishop Bereczky.

Let us now call as witnesses two other bishops, Peter and Veto.

On December 20, 1956, Bishop John Peter spoke at length and with great thoroughness to a General Assembly of his church in Hungary concerning the events of that year.

The situation in Hungary just prior to October 23 had taken a relaxing turn. The government was beginning to ease up on the iron discipline involved in building socialism in a hostile world. In fact Bishop Peter warned his fellow-pastors to take care not to abuse this relaxation. And on October 23 he made a statement to the Hungarian News Agency declaring that a murderous attempt was being made against the people just as they stood on the threshold of great developments.

As to the counter-revolution and the motives behind it Bishop Peter said there had been faults and blunders (his own among the rest) in leadership, but *the counter-revolution was not created by these faults;* the counter-revolution was made by counter-revolutionaries whereas the people taking part in these events did not know what they were doing.

"But there were people" said John Peter, "who knew what they were doing. Anyone listening to "Radio Free Europe" in those days need no other proof to be certain that *the events were in the hands of international reaction.* "Radio Free Europe" was broadcasting as the agency of a military headquarters. Colonel Bell gave orders in his announcements: who, where, in what circumstances and with what weapons to fight.

"You must realize that it was not a political structure but the existence of a whole people that was at stake.

"Those men who . . . realized that Imre Nagy's activity was dragging the nation to final catastrophe and made up their minds to stop him by asking help from the Soviet Union knew well what a heavy decision they made, but it was *either that* or *final annihilation !*

"It meant agony for the Soviet Union and for us too, but *the life of Hungary was saved and world war checked.*"

As for the preparation for the Counter-revolution, "*the meeting of the World Council of Churches Central Committee* in Galyateto, Hungary in the summer of 1956 *was in organic connection with that preparation.*" While the tragedy was progressing "Laszlo Pap and Visser't Hooft kept joyfully telephoning to each other about what was happening and what was going to happen in Hungary.

Some time after the failure of the Counter Revolution during which some of the Budapest pastors had been arrested, Bishop Peter was rung up in the Institute for Cultural Relations, by Marcellus Pradervand from Geneva.

Here is the way the conversation went as reported by Bishop Peter. "My dear John, I am very happy to hear your voice."

My reply: "Dear Marcellus you could have heard my voice earlier, for instance at the end of October and the beginning of November." Then he: "I did not know your phone number." My answer: "As you are able to trace the phone number of the Institute for Cultural Relations, you could have found me still more easily by phone in Debrecen at the end of October and the beginning of November. You had only to call for Janos Peter in Debrecen. But tell me please what it is you are ringing me for." He said: "I should like to appeal to your sense of responsibility and ask you to intercede for those unhappy people who are in the custody of the police." My answer was as follows: "Dear Marcellus I am not inclined to accept or even to listen to any appeal from your side to my sense of responsibility. In the four hundred years' history of the Protestant churches in Hungary perhaps there has been nobody so detrimental to their affairs as you and Visser't Hooft. I have been working for ten years to prevent these things happening. I did my utmost for these people through ten years. Even now I do all I can but I do not want to talk about it with you."

By that time he was apologizing and saying he did not share Visser't Hooft's views on Hungarian events, and that he had not encouraged Laszlo Pap. To which I gave the following answer: "I have not looked into it to any degree but one thing is undeniable. You did nothing to withold Visser 't Hooft and Pap from that horror into which they dragged the church."

Bishop Peter confirmed the statement of Bishop Bereczky concerning the resignation of his predecessor Bishop Laszlo Ravasz. "I am the star witness of Laszlo Ravasz's resignation . . . In 1948 when the Reformed church had to be reorganized, I spoke to Laszlo Ravasz telling him that according to my best conviction it would be advisable to resign. He accepted this with open heart saying that he had had it in mind to renounce his office in the autumn of 1948. I told him of my firm belief that the church's advance necessitated that Albert Bereczky should take over this office as early as possible. Laszlo Razasz agreed with me."

Apparently strange things happened to Ravasz, as they frequently do when men of mediocrity are suddenly pushed into positions of irresponsible power. According to Bishop Peter, Ravasz, in the midst of the revolution, publicly placed Peter in the category of those who were being killed by the Counter Revolutionists' groups in Budapest in those days. "Had I been in Budapest," says Bishop Peter, "at that time, I may have met that fate as a result of Laszlo Ravasz's words."

Bishop Lajos Veto of the Hungarian Lutheran church, editor of the *Church Press*, is a solid big man, both physically and spiritually. Early this year he published an important statement on the problems of his church in Hungary. Let us see what he says. Occasionally I shall emphasize certain of his words.

"The Liberation, for our country, meant liberation from

fascism, and, at the same time, the liquidation of the old and obsolete social and economic system and the beginning of a new era which envisages the building up of a socialistic society.

"There were people in the church right at the outset who agreed with us as to the need of liquidating the old system and readily accepted the programme of introducing the new one.

The Horthy "Cold War:"

"This new thinking arose in spite of the fact that, during the war, an intensive propaganda had been carried on in the church against socialism and *particularly against the Soviet Union.* Under the influence of this propaganda some of our church leaders, towards the end of the war, had begun to prepare our pastors for the future, exhorting them that, if the Allies won and especially if the troops of the Soviet Union came into Hungary, they must be ready to accept martyrdom.

"I talked with more than one pastor, during the war, Lutherans and others, who said that, in case of a communist victory we might as well dig our graves in advance.

"There can be no doubt that a propaganda of this nature had its effects on the minds of our pastors, so that not only they but also the majority of their parishioners and even of those estranged from the church were convinced that, after the marching in of the Soviet troops, all church and religious life would cease in Hungary.

"This fear lived on in many of our pastors even when they saw with no slight amazement that *the Soviet Military commanders,* in giving their first instructions, *called on the pastors to start* church life, *to open the churches.*

"When, however, this fear had passed, the inner antagonism reasserted itself in many a mind. The latter development was decisively furthered by the fact that, for several years after the Liberation, the leadership of our church remained the same as that which had governed the church during the war and over the major part of the Horthy era.

The Church's Vested Interest:

"Since *this church leadership* was composed of those who, as a result of the land reform, *suddenly lost their landed estates, social position* and, with that, *also their political aims,* they now tried to realize their hopes of *recapturing their wealth* and *social privileges by mobilising the church against the new social order.* It is humanly understandable that these people refused to take cognisance of the radical change, hoping that, after a short period of temporary military occupation, the social changes would be liquidated and everything would return to the old order. It was in this way that the leadership of the church became at once mixed up with political ends and attempts were made to make the church an instrument of political reaction.

"This *old leadership* refused to recognise the fact that now the Hungarian people, as in 1918-1919, had decided again for the road of socialism, and that socialism, though facing terrific difficulties and assaults by the enemy, was marching forward step by

step, all over the whole world. *This was what the old leadership could not agree with,* and so it *chased illusions,* and it was according to this state of mind, that the pastors of our church were also *'informed.'* Even in 1947, a senior official in one of the church centres of Budapest was in the habit of saying to visiting country pastors: *'Only a few weeks; two months, at the worst.'*

"But we also had pastors and laymen, who, from the very beginning saw that this was not simply a case of military occupation but something entirely different; and they knew that the old regime could never return. They realised that, *after the debacle of fascism, our country* and people *had been enveloped by the power sphere of the socialist world revolution,* and hence it was undergoing a radical social and economic transformation.

"Their Christian ethos made them realise that it was right that we, turning our backs on chauvinism, try to *demolish the scandalous differences that existed between man and man, a Hungarian and another Hungarian,* in the Horthy era, and that we do this not only on paper but actively approving and supporting the change also in economic and cultural fields.

"They recognized further that *this transformation, both at home and abroad, had run up against terrific difficulties and strong enemies.* Therefore, they could not agree with the idea, either from the viewpoint of God's will or that of humanity, that the church should be made an instrument of bringing back the old order. They knew that the church was in a position to give effective and positive support in the great transformation, along the line of the Christian love of man, and that their work, too, had its place in the rebuilding of the country and in developing a more just order of society.

"They, therefore, felt concern over the activity of the high church leadership—this heritage of the Horthy era—seeing how *the church leaders took advantage of their church positions, wantonly gambling with the church for their perishable earthly goods which were anyhow irretrievable.*

"They perceived, with prophetic eyes, what the church leadership refused to see: that this revolution demanded a change in every man, irresistibly marching forward as it was; that the Church, Christianity, had its place in the social revolution, seeking the building up of socialism, and that *definitely wrong were those who said that the victory of socialism meant the destruction of the Church and Christianity* (in this they had both the reactionaries and the extreme Marxists against them).

"The old leadership soon came into conflict with the dictatorship of the proletariat. The state according to a general principle of the freedom of conscience and of religion, sought peaceful coexistence and positive cooperation with the church, and proposed an agreement in order to clarify the relation between church and state. However, in connection with the nationalisation of the schools, an open conflict developed. The state could not tolerate the obstacle which ecclesiastical reaction put in the way of build-

ing up socialism. So the church reaction, and the old church leadership, had to yield ground.

"Thus the church became involved in a very difficult situation. The danger was that it would remain without leadership. However, some of the pastors and lay leaders, ignoring the threats of the still vigorous church reaction (all this will be soon over, they said, and then comes the time of vengeance on those who wanted good relations with socialism), trusting in God and, at the same time, in a better, more just social order, decided to negotiate an agreement with the state. The reaction said that this step would discredit our church for ever in the eyes of *Roman Catholicism* which, at that time, *under the leadership of Mindszenty, was the strongest basis of reaction.* The progressive forces of the church, however, came to the conclusion that the normalising of our relations with the state would secure the possibility of the church's ministry in the socialistic order.

"All who remember the reactionary spirit which prevailed in our Lutheran Church after the Liberation, understand that the reaction did everything in its power to justify its forecast, that is, that the position of the church in socialism be as difficult as possible. Therefore it put obstacles in the way of the work of the progressive leadership, not shrinking from the use of even the most reprehensible methods.

"Progressive men were slandered, especially when they joined the fight for world peace, and attempts were made to discredit them in the congregations. They alleged that the progressive church leaders had taken the road of the so-called "German Christians," who, in Hitler's days transformed the teachings of Christianity, rejected the Old Testament as the Bible of the Jews and so on. Efforts were made to instigate the ecclesiastical world organisations against the progressive leaders. Foreign church aid was stopped. They assailed continuously, through the foreign press and radio, our progressive leaders, alleging that they were usurping their positions, selling out, betraying and ruining the church.

When Non-politics is Politics:

"There is no doubt that the members of the old church leadership and the pastors supporting them acted in the spirit of Horthy's Counter Revolution of 1919.

"Their attitude did not change, when after the progressive pastors and laymen stood up to make themselves heard, the reaction gave out the slogan that the church and the pastors should keep clear of politics. This was supported with the argument that, under nazism, the church and many pastors had discredited themselves. The same argument was employed to keep our progressive pastors out of the peace movement. This unpolitical standpoint was recommended as the only right attitude for churchmen, at all times and everywhere, whereas in the Western churches and in the ecclesiastical world organisations, it is to the very opposite that churchmen, including pastors, were and are exhorted. As to

proofs, one could point to many resolutions of Western churches and ecclesiastical world organisations, but let it suffice to quote now just one of the most recent resolutions of this nature. The All African Conference held on the 17th of January, 1958, in Ibadan of Nigeria issued a declaration which contains, among others, the following statement: "The Church has the task to proclaim, in full humility, to the entire human society the will of God as she understands it. Therefore she cannot take an indifferent or even passive attitude to the decisive political and social issues of life.' (Oekumenischer Pressedienst, January 31, 1958).

Success:

"It was under a constant barrage of hostile attacks that the progressive leadership governed our church. However, the passing years justified their prophetic vision. In the first place, *the church* —humanly speaking—*was not ruined* because they had sought and found the way of the church in the socialistic system. Not only that; the work of the church *became more substantial and responsible;* the diakonia and press work of the church made good progress; even in the difficult economic situation *the most important church literature was published,* the publication of the church confessions was organised and promoted, the work of the pastors' study fellowship was initiated, etc.

"And the decision to take the only ethical standpoint, in modern times, as to the issue of war and peace, and to participate, from the beginning, in the peace movement, *earned respect for the church in the socialistic society* not only at home but also in the neighbouring socialist countries. Our church was not relegated to ghetto or to the catacombs, as the reaction had prophesied. The church was in the position to develop the church press, moreover, to make use of the radio for preaching, the conditions of the pastors' work also materially, were secured, and the church tried to defend, without discrimination, even the most reactionary pastors, from the effects of the mostly justified dissatisfaction of the state. Far from doing anything like the activity of the "German Christion Faith Movement" in Hitler's days, the church, on the contrary, tried to do justice, in all branches of its work, to the principle of Scriptural and confessional loyalty. This was all the more possible as *the state never tried to persuade the church to make ideological concessions* or to change its doctrines.

"It was but natural that the progressive church leadership was unable to do everything perfectly; even mistakes were committed, and probably their weakest spot was that *they failed to take into consideration,* with sufficient seriousness, *the strength of the reaction inside and outside,* and failed to oppose it with sufficient energy and resoluteness, particularly in spiritual matters, with the weapons of conviction and enlightenment.

"It was for the purpose of uncovering and correcting these mistakes that the progressive leaders arranged, in the late summer of 1956, pastors' conferences at which the fullest freedom of speech

was guaranteed to the pastors to tell their complaints and grievances. At the same time, the leaders also made efforts to remedy personal injuries, and so, in the first place, did not decline *the request of the World Council of Churches* and the Lutheran World Federation, *to effect,* with the consent of the government of Hungary *the rehabilitation of Lajos Ordass.*

"When, in this manner, the progressive church leaders, in the summer and autumn of 1956, in the atmosphere of the greater and general political freedom, made efforts to correct the actual mistakes and to remedy the injuries suffered by persons, *suddenly a pre-organised and obviously centrally directed barrage of attacks was let loose on the progressive church leaders,* and directed also against our state and against socialism.

"These charges were levelled at the progressive church leaders: 1. they were committing acts of lawlessness; 2. they were teaching bad theology, especially about building socialism; 3. their financial affairs were not in order; 4. they discriminated in the filling of charges and in the distribution of church aid; 5. they had introduced a cult of personalities and a system of cliques; 6. generally the pastors and the people of the church had no confidence in them and so it was demanded that they give the leadership to Lajos Ordass.

"*Today there can be no doubt that the Counter-Revolution had been thoroughly prepared, from abroad,* and in our church, too, *steps had been taken by foreigners to prepare and detonate the events of the Counter Revolution.* I was told early in the summer of 1955 by an American churchman, 'A big change is to come in Hungary', adding that he had very close contacts with the government circles of the United States. Today, this remark is for me the strongest proof that the Counter-Revolution was not a "spontaneous uprising," but that it had been carefully engineered beforehand both in the whole country and in our church.

"This is further corroborated by the fact that the 'change of guards' in our church closely followed the pattern which was employed in the entire Counter-Revolution, until it was defeated. To wit, *the justified dissatisfaction in the face of actual mstakes was rapidly manipulated in order to upset the entire lawful order,* to relegate the progressive leadership, and to capture all the 'key positions'. *One cannot make a thinking and sincere man believe that the identical procedure was a mere coincidence,* and that it was also pure chance that the times of the events lamentably coincided. It would be difficult to call it a lawful procedure which becomes the church when, in the days of the Counter-Revolution, *an armed counter-revolutionary called on Bishop Laszlo Dezsery and Dean Dr. Miklos Palfy in order to make them resign. I too was warned* by well-meaning and less well-meaning persons, to the effect that they could 'hardly restrain the armed revolutionary youth', so *why do I wait any longer.*

Visser 't Hooft Again !

"Even in November, 1956, *Visser 't Hooft* sent a telephone

message to the then functioning leaders of the Hungarian Protestant churches that they should quickly fill with their own men all the important positions, before our state power regained its senses. This plan did not succeed in the Reformed Church, but was followed in our church. *The 'changing of the guards' went on even after the debacle of the Counter Revolution.*

"The counter-revolutionary church leadership was able to carry on its functions without any interruptions for more than a year. Our state gave them its full confidence, while the relegated progressives of the clergy could only painfully recover from the spiritual wounds that were inflicted on them in 1956 and 1957.

"In November, 1957, the new leadership sat down to negotiate with the State Office for Church Affairs the relations of our church to the state. They prepared in concord the contents of a declaration of principles, which then was signed on the 21st of January, 1958, by the General Presidium of our church. It was at that time that the General Secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, Dr. C. E. *Lund-Quist, and Dr. William Vajta,* the Director of the Study Department of the Lutheran World Federation, visited Hungary. After this event Lajos *Ordass*—although he was in agreement with the declaration that, in the meantime, had been drawn up—took such a rigid attitude toward the state that the Senate Office for Church Affairs, seeing no meaning in further wrangling, broke off the negotiations and appointed a ministerial commissioner to control our church.

"When with General Inspector Erno Mihalyfi we took over the leadership of our church we considered it one of our first tasks to have this ministerial commissioner recalled, that is, to have the autonomy of our church restored. To effect this, it was necessary to take up again and conclude the broken-down negotiations with the state. We discussed again all the existing problems. We reached clarification. We proposed the same declaration of the 21st of January which we had discussed again with the members of the church commission which, under the leadership of Lajos Ordass, had originally negotiated with the state. They were Jozsef *Szabo,* Dr. Andras *Keken,* Dr. Gyula *Nagy,* Karoly *Grunvalszky,* Dr. Miklos *Palfy* and Adam *Mekis.* All members of the commission urged the conclusion of the negotiations. The State Office for Church Affairs did not insist on the changing of a single word in the declaration.

"Holy" Liars:

"All the Western church papers wrote that the declaration was the work of Mihalyfi and Veto, because only they could regard the 'Kadar government' as 'the authority ordained by God'. The well-informed Lutheran World Federation could have at once stopped the attacks which came in response to our declaration, since it would have been enough to inform the press and the radio that it was Lajos *Ordass* himself who had appointed, on the 12th of November, the first day of the negotiations, the ecclesi-

astical members of the commission for the drafting of the declaration."

Thus Dr. Veto, unshaken by the fascist storm, immovable in loyalty to the spirit of Jesus, passionate in his devotion to world peace. He stays in the Church as a teacher of theology, but no longer as a working Bishop. Laszlo Deszery, another of the progressives, has resigned as Bishop.

Janos Peter resigns as Bishop after counselling the church as to *what is to be done:* (1) Seek repentence; (2) Choose natural leaders; (3) Call to account those responsible for the deterioration; (4) *Get to the roots of the church's illness.* Take energetic measures against any leftover, symptom, personal representative, teaching, and *captivating attitude of the reaction.* "Those who still adore America must rid themselves of America definitively. America is not valued so highly even by the Americans as by some of the Hungarian Reformed reactionaries."

Peter, Bereczky, Veto, Deszery, these men fairly represent the progressive elements in Hungarian Protestantism. They have not failed. What mistakes they made were from an excess of trust.

This writer visited them in 1949 and was struck by their qualities of humility and strength. Knowing something of the *World Council of Churches* I have ventured many times to warn them of its ineluctable servitude to the profit worshipping societies of the West, in particular the USA, whose Rockefeller's donations and whose Rockefeller's Dulles have been misdirecting and betraying it from the start.

The Chief function of the World Council has been to wrap up and *close off the moral power of Jesus,* to turn inside out his condemnation of exploitation, to *erase his communism* and that of his followers for the first three centuries of his era and to *make that communism into a crime.* Moreover, the World Council has been a functionary of the Cold War even to the abysmal extent of approving the Korea horror. Surely this was enough to open the eyes of these good Hungarian churchmen. And now they are attacked in their own country by a Hapsburg Counter Revolution!

This is not a matter of the personal forgiveness of a Visser 't Hooft by a Bereczky. Forgiveness follows on repentance. Forgiveness must be asked before it can be given. This is a matter of principalities and powers, to be precise, of a power greater than that of two or three empires put together: *oil.* There are thousands of Christians in the *World Council who do not know* that it *serves the oil cartel.*

Inordinate Church Concern:

Bereczky in his speech of resignation (not accepted) tried hard to get to the bottom of the troubles of his church. Some of his difficulty may have been theological, but mostly it has been a simple and natural confidence in the good faith of the World Council of Churches.

Just prior to his being stricken with severe illness he had

over-spent himself serving the Council. He had run here and there preparing the very Galysteto meeting which was to be his own undoing. The Council's Western representatives were after all lofty men of the church, full of exactly the same phrases he used, but meaning just the opposite of what he meant. Full of "devotion" to "Christ" how could they be expected to be so expert with the assassin's knife?

Then, Bereczky (possibly it is the Barthian influence), we dare say, underestimates his own motives. He says: "For the last ten years I wish I could reply that it (my motive) was my desire to seek and obey the will of God. Alas, I cannot say so."

What was his "lower" motive?

It was "my love for my people."

"I know it is this that God has now judged." For "this love obscured my vision." "We do not always love according to the heart of God." Then it was not "love" in itself. It was the quality of his love he questioned.

For if Bereczky had tried to shield his people from the consequences of their acts he would not have been giving them "true love." True love confronts the loved one with the result of his act. True love is not sentimental love. Nor did it seem to me was Bereczky's. He never ceased to call for repentance and for turning to a more deeply realized service to God and man.

However, he knows himself better than we can know him. And what he is saying amounts to this: I was too easy on my people. I did not sufficiently strive to bring them to a sense of the crisis in which they stood.

Perhaps not. The New Christian felt terribly disturbed when the Hungarian churches remained in the World Council of Churches after Toronto. Wondering why they stayed there, giving countenance to a morally defunct institution, it occurred to us that it might have been explained by pressure from the Hungarian state on the supposition that the ecumenical movement could help the cause of peace. At least the Hungarian state put no obstacles in the way of the church's attending conferences in various parts of the globe.

However that may be, we are glad that the state-church liaison official has now suggested that the church travel less and tend the home fires more.

Bereczky also speaks a bit ruefully of a cooling of his relationship with the evangelistic elements in his church. He says he wholeheartedly regrets this estrangement.

But a formal evangelism can be a road to hell. It is *the substance of evangelism which must be cleaned of cruelty and stripped of greed.* True, this can be done effectively only by a new evangelism, anti-war, anti-fascist. It isn't evangelism which is at fault. It is the false evangel: the evangel, for instance, of the magic formula of belief, or the evangel of the false second coming of a "Christ" which is nothing but a regime of violence, literally a tornado. This storm-cellar evangelism continues to this day in

Hungary and to a certain extent even in Russia. It will not likely die until the task spoken of by Bereczky has been accomplished, namely "the understanding . . . our new situation and accepting that situation as coming from the hand of God and so disclosing not only His judgment but also His mercy toward us."

What does this mean? Not only "judgment." "Mercy" too. Not only the "no" but a "yes". The "new situation" is simply socialism.

So we Christians, beloved brothers, are forced to find "God" and "Christ" *in the quality* of historical events, *not in the mere fact that they happened!* Moreover, we Christians, *if we are followers of Jesus,* are committed to communism in advance. We do not have to wait for it to be introduced. We must in every age and forever work to bring it about. For communism is of the essence of the teaching and example of Jesus and of his first disciples.

Bereczky reproaches himself for having had what he calls "an unduly strong sense of security," not for himself but for his charges, and also for an "over confidence which cast its shadow on my service during the last years of our church life." He says they had overstressed topicality or timeliness in preaching, neglecting or dismissing lightly "the eternal human" needs.

Let Bereczky give an example in his own words:

> "Emphasis has been laid in our time—and with right—in the wide fields of human living, on the idea of fellowship. It is clear that, even in this respect, the church has many a useful and radical message of the Bible to deliver which may have bearing even on such practical problems as those concerning collective farming or the peace movement. Hence our pulpits may speak about the agricultural producing cooperatives or about the common destiny of 'all nations of men made by God of one blood' when making today our choice between peace and war, that is, life and death.
>
> "Yet it should not have been obscured either, neither pushed into the background that human community is not the aggregation of lifeless objects but *a fellowship of living personalities, and the infinite value of the individual soul must find its emphasis in preaching and in other church work.* If we remain loyal to our Master who told us the parables of the lost sheep, lost coin and of the prodigal son, then we must give due place in all our preaching and teaching to the great text: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'
>
> "It is quite certain that no one in the Reformed Church in Hungary had rejected those teachings of the gospel which lay so great an emphasis on the *abiding* experiences of the *individual* soul. Unfortunately, the people in the revival movement could only assess the task of the church from the exclusive viewpoint of the individual soul and of individual

salvation, while the large perspectives and timely imperatives of the Kingdom of God had remained for them in the background. We could initiate a debate as to which side lived on the failures of the other side."

Right here where he talks about "a fellowship of living personalities" Bereczky may be putting his finger on the exact place where his church could make a real substantial contribution to the work of building communism.

Moreover, such a contribution would be a *teaching* contribution, a *leading* contribution. It might indeed (I believe it would) bring the Communist Manifesto into the New Testament to the glory of the revolutionary Carpenter.

Or if not *his* church (or indeed *any* church) some other agency may be used by God, who wears out churches and throws away churches, to emphasize the truth of God's love of *undivided* men.

Credo unam ecclesiam (esse). Not: Credo *in* unam ecclesiam. I believe there *is* one church. *Not:* I believe *in* one church. That *in* represents the heresy of Rome and is the constant temptation of Protestant churches, big and little. It is in fact a species of atheism, for in the dialectic of thought it has come about that the true theists are those who call themselves atheists and the "bishops" of war and hate and greed are the veritable atheists.

This is what Bereczky actually implies in his volcanic indictment of "the cold and decaying life of the church which found expression in the *enthusiastic acclamation of war,* in the *approval of the Anti-Jewish legislation* and in *the failure to risk its own life to prevent the massacre of the Jews.*"

Bereczky himself personally *did* risk his life to save Jewish lives. When the new regime came to power Bereczky became a bishop but the change was too sudden for Hungarian Protestantism. The burden of re-aligning the churches was too great for Veto and Peter and Bereczky and their small company. Yet they might have succeeded had they done what the Chinese did and *brushed foreign influence off their doorstep.* They might have succeeded but for the World Council of Churches. And their success might well have been enough to have thwarted the plans for the Fascist Counter Revolution, forestalling the tragic necessity of calling for Soviet help to smash it and preventing the sacrifice of many misguided victims of American-Vatican propaganda.

THE WAR AGAINST THE PEOPLE

By Louise Harding

When Hitler finally decided to strike at France, the friends of freedom were horrified at the collapse of the French army, theretofore considered most capable. Afterwards the truth came out: the soldiers were prepared to fight,—they were betrayed by their officers. Read the memoirs of Genevieve Tabouis to see how the fabric of French resistance was rotted with Fascism in high places—the spirit of "HITLER RATHER THAN BLUM!"

The same is true today. It is not true, however, that de Gaulle has now destroyed democracy in France, because France did not have democracy. The largest political party in France, standing for the interests of the submerged workers—without fundamental reform in their financial standing, as elsewhere in the world, there can never be real prosperity and peace—was shunted aside, in spite of the fact that it had 150 members in the Assembly. One combination after another lacked stability on this account—and not, as claimed, because of the multiplicity of parties; for proportional representation does mean democracy.

Trying to crush the rights of the native population of Algiers, and take possession of the oil deposits, France built up her military colonial force which, turning on her, threatened invasion by paratroopers. *Just as in 1940,* the ruling French forces decided not to fight. Here is a lesson for USA, whose controlling cartelists, backed by Eisenhower, seek to build up an immense mercenary military force.

At the moment when decision in France trembled in the balance, Eisenhower threw in his weight for de Gaulle—he liked him, he said. On June 3, after de Gaulle had won, Eisenhower wished him good luck. Said he:

> "Dear Mr. Prime Minister:" (de Gaulle is not a P.M.; for the time, at least, he is a dictator)—
>
> "I wish to offer you my personal congratulations and good wishes on assuming direction of the French nation . . . . You can be assured of my sympathy . . . "

A message not surprising from the official who sent his personal physician, at public expense, to attend the tyrant of Nicaragua, who since 1936 had crushed freedom in that land. My desk dictionary says of Somoza that he was "opposed by the head of the Conservative party" and was "bitterly criticized by liberals the world over. Prolonged political strife has slowed down Nicaragua's development . . . " Somoza's tactics precluded any other way of removing him from the political scene rather than the means used by the young patriot who killed him. Yet, Eisenhower sent Somoza his condolences, presuming to speak in the name of the people of USA. It was a disgrace.

On the assumption of power by de Gaulle, the chorus of praise that arose in this country drowned out the liberals (if any) who

denounced the move. Styles Bridges, of the China Lobby, said: "De Gaulle at least is strong and anti-Communistic." Capehart, of Indiana, openly approved.

After the liberation of France from the Nazis, John F. Dulles was de Gaulle's adviser "against the Communist menace."

Coty told Pinay (leader of right-wing Independents), Jean Teitgen (Catholic Republicans), and Guy Mollet (Socialists):

> "If you say the word I will call on the general and ask him to form a Government. If you do not want that and will not support de Gaulle then I may call in Francois Mitterant (Leftwing Democratic Socialist Republicans) and let him try to form a Popular Front Government. But I tell you this, gentlemen, right here and now; if it comes to forming a Popular Front Government it is going to be done without me. I shall resign."

Beaverbrook's Scottish Daily Express had a reporter in Algiers. May 29, he talked to M. Robert Abdesselam, just back from Paris where he dictated rebel terms to political leaders in Paris, thus:

> "General Salan personally ordered me to tell Paris that if they do not give us a de Gaulle Government we will invade France with paratroops."

Mollet, betrayer of the Socialists, in a letter to de Gaulle, spoke (reports the London Daily Herald, May 29) of

> "his own fears that events might lead in a matter of hours, weeks, months or years to a Popular Front with its inevitable consequence—a people's democracy.
>
> "This was done behind the backs of the French Socialist Party. And it is bound to harden their belief that whether de Gaulle comes or not, French Socialism must have a quite different leadership."

Drew Pearson reported:—

> "The United States is prepared to take drastic action in case of a worsening political crisis in France. Because France is the heart of the NATO alliance for the defense of Europe, and because all supply lines, communications lines and pipelines run across France, vitally important changes would be necessary in case a hostile government should take over Paris.
>
> Therefore, three alternatives have been decided upon, upon careful consideration both in Paris and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington. These have been approved by the National Security council as follows:
>
> (1) The United States is prepared to move its entire atomic stockpile out of France . . . (to previously prepared bases in Spain, or Germany).
>
> (2) In case of disastrous French civil war, the United States would also pull out all military forces to North Africa.
>
> (3) If the Communists took over, the United States would intervene militarily—although only as a last resort and only in cooperation with French middle-of-the-road poli-

tical leaders.

... these (plans) have definitely been approved by the highest authorities in Washington."

(It was not a question of the Communists taking over, as was well understood. It was a Popular Front that the reactionaries were objecting to.)

Hitler summed up the case. Feb. 1933, speaking to a gathering of bankers and industrialists at Goering's house in Berlin, (see Victor H. Bernstein's "Final Judgment," p. 34), he "talked dictatorship:

"Private enterprise cannot be maintained in the age of Democracy. It is conceivable only if the people have a sound idea of authority and personality."

"After Hitler had left the room, Dr. Schacht proposed to the meeting the raising of an election fund of, so far as I remember, three million Reichsmarks."

"Before the meeting was over, Krupp von Bohlen expressed to Hitler 'the gratitude of approximately twenty-five industrialists present for having given us such a clear picture of the conception of his ideas."

When resources rightly public, have been sufficiently looted into private hands, democracy is impossible: something that our "reformers" simply cannot, or will not, understand.

An editorial in the *Gazette and Daily* says: To many people here it seems as though truly popular government in the United States is as an all-time low."

—Low, indeed! What we have here today is clerico-fascism, (control by corporations and church), very thinly disguised in ordinary times, and with the veil entirely cast off whenever the real rulers are bent on war. Then, EVERYTHING GOES !

We are all greatly indebted to atty. Fyke Farmer for setting forth in the Brief whereby he sought to compel observance of the Nuremberg Law, the true story of How U.S.A. got the war on Korea going. i.e., the big-corporation agent then acting as secretary of war suggested the initial steps, and Truman said O.K., acting without authority of Congress or anybody else. Let us remember again, just what took place—in flat contradiction to the lies Harry Truman has been pouring forth in excuse, ever since that time. The members of Senate and House were called in the morning and told what had been decided on the evening before, which was June 26. At six o'clock that same day, the (illegal) Security Council—without China and Russia—and whose members were financially dependent on USA—obediently affixed their signatures and the slaughter began.

Senator Wayne Morse now says, the present Administration is the most corrupt we ever had; and, he informs "Ike" that he can tell him a secret: to-wit, he is not wanted any more. The press had a "chance" to report these withering remarks: but the only place this reporter garnered it was by radio (one time).

Who Runs USA?

Reverting to the subject of democracy in this "land of the free," here is a quote from Harvey O'Connor's "Empire of Oil", Ch. 19:—

> "Robert W. Calvert, chairman in 1947 of the Texas Democratic party and as conservative as most Lone Star politicians, put the matter bluntly when he introduced a member of the Texas Railroad Commission to the Lions Club in Hillsboro.
>
> 'It may not be a wholesome thing to say,' he announced, 'but the oil industry is in complete control of the state government and state politics.' The oil industry had become so big that it controls 'economic, political and social life. The income from the oil industry is so great and the avenues and outlets of its influence so numerous and so far-flung it can bring about any governmental program behind which it unites and defeat any program against it.' "

Ike Doctrine in Committee:

It may be interesting to look back at some of the sessions of the joint committees on Foreign Relations, and Armed Services, during January and February, 1957.

P. 5 of official report:—

Dulles: "... the Middle East is a vital part of the free world. The people there have aspirations for liberty" (Saudi Arabia, Iran) "such as have always struck a responsive chord in the hearts of the American people." (See Guatemala). "Much of the world's livelihood depends on the natural resources and avenues of trade of the Middle East. And there are to be found the holy places of three great religions.

"It would be abhorrent and dangerous if that area were ruled by international communism . . .

"No one can reliably predict whether, and if so, when, there would be Communist armed aggression" (now he asserts that there doesn't have to be any) "but three things are known: (1) the Communist capability, (2) the temptation, (3) the lack of any moral restraints."

> (This from the country whose government perpetrated the most ghastly massacres in history, at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; accomplished for purely political motives, and when our rulers knew the Japanese were anxious to give up).

"We saw open armed aggression against the Republic of Korea."

> (It was not, and is not, a Republic; but rather a dictatorship established by the armed might of USA against a small and helpless people. Rhee and his Prime Minister have *confessed* the south started the war, and have tried to justify their incursion into the north.

Pg. 25, Sen. Fulbright inquires: Mr. Secretary, is there any significant new evidence that the Soviet Union is planning a direct aggression in the general area of the Middle East?

Secretary Dulles. There is no evidence that we are aware of

(but says he doesn't think they would give advance notice).

Pg. 27, Fulbright thinks the Resolution does not go far enough: that US should not limit itself to armed invasion as a cause for intervention.

Secretary Dulles: Well, we are saying that we are going to live up to our obligation in the Charter of the United Nations and in all, I think, of our mutual security treaties, that we only act militarily for defense *in case an armed attack occurs.*

That is the language of the Charter of the United Nations, which, of course, we are committed to, and the Senate has ratified.

(Compare that with his statement (AP) of May 20, 1958, that this resolution could apply to Lebanon even though it is not under attack by Communist forces."—A regular three-card monte man—"Now you see it, and now you don't!"

Pg. 29, Fulbright asks, Who determines whether or not a country is Communist dominated, and what are the criteria of determining that under this resolution ?

Dulles replies, the President.

(The truth: Eisenhower determines nothing. If need be, Dulles has shown he is willing to contradict him openly).

P. 31, Fulbright inquires,

It is correct to say that a principal security interest of the United States in the Middle East lies in the denial of the resources—particularly petroleum—to a potential enemy in time of war?

The answer was of a classified nature.

P. 154, Sen. Morse: Mr. Secretary, in many of your statements that I have read, and also the President's speech, the phrase is used over and over again, "The free nations of the Middle East." Would you name for the committee the nations of the Middle East that are free nations, in the sense of . . . having the rights of freedom such as we know them with respect to our Bill of Rights . . . ? "

Dulles: . . . whenever I used (those words), I used them not to describe the internal freedoms of the people, but whether or not the nation itself is free from external domination.

(Who runs Persia? Venezuela? Guatemala? Mexico? Who tells Canada where she may or may not market her commodities?)

If necessary, you would support a police force in a country to keep down an uprising that you thought was wrong? Is that correct?

Dulles: If we felt that a country was unable by its own resources to maintain the security forces necessary for internal order and prevent Communist subversion, then we would consider assisting there.

(Is that how things used to go in Venezuela, one would like very much indeed to know. Drew Pearson, May 23 of this year, mentions that Venezuelans "remember the acclaim we

gave their former President, dictator Perez Jimenez, and his brutal secret police chief, Pedro Estrada, both charged with wholesale murder of political opponents." Estrada established himself comfortably in the United States, without objection from State. And (May 20), re. the Nixon fiasco in Caracas, Dulles lamented at a news conference, that Venezuela's police force "virtually melted away at the sight of trouble." So different from the good old days!)

Pg. 273, Sen. Morse: The issue I want to raise is whether or not this resolution might conceivably lead us into a fact situation in one of these Middle East countries where an internal political disorder or a civil war involving a contest between two governments, one Communist-dominated and the other not, places us under this resolution under the duty of coming to the assistance of the non-Communist government.

Dulles: Of course, that is exactly what we did in Korea, and we did not have any resolution then, either.

Morse: We did not have any resolution at all. Of course, you remember the next day I said we were at war when other people were talking about police action, and suggested we ought to take congressional action on it too.

I have never varied from that point of view. But your answer to my question is that under this hypothetical case I have put, we would decide whether or not under those facts and circumstances the situation involved aggression on the part of the Soviet Union itself?

Dulles: Yes, sir.

Morse suggests that plan would be very dangerous, so a President ought to get permission of Congress before starting in.

Dulles replies there is danger everywhere in the world (a universe full of brinks), and he thinks the resolution diminishes it. "As I pointed out, the exact hypothetical case that you referred to occurred in Korea. There had been no prior resolution, and YET WE GOT INTO WAR." (My Caps).

(They were always maintaining it was no war. If it had been, Truman would have been acknowledged to violate the Constitution openly. The above situation clearly applies to Lebanon today—that is, if they can prove Communists are leading the uprising, which has *not* been shown).

An Uninformed Secretary of State:

Pg. 309, Sen. Long: In your judgment, did President Truman have any right to send American forces or any power to send American forces into Korea?

Dulles: I never studied that as a lawyer.

Long: Never considered it?

Dulles: No, sir.

On the Brink.

Pg. 251. Sen. Kefauver: But can you give us as an assurance, that before the Armed Forces of this Nation will be used under circumstances which might bring about a substantial conflict,

that the President would ask for a declaration that a state of war existed?

Dulles: Not prior to their use; no, sir. The whole purpose of this resolution is to make clear that the Armed Forces will be available to resist open armed aggression by a country controlled by international communism.

(Now he says it does not have to be "open armed aggression.")

Pg. 268. Morse wants to know whether if a President starts a war, Congress has the right to rescind such an action. Dulles is dubious.

Morse: Let's apply it to this situation. We pass the resolution. Russia commits an act which the President decides is an act of military aggression against a Middle East country. He orders American military forces, troops either naval or air, into action against Russia or the forces that have crossed the border of this Arab State.

He then advises Congress that that is his course of action. Let's assume he then asks Congress for a declaration that a state of war exists. Would Congress have the right in your opinion not only to refuse to grant his request but to pass a resolution directing the President to rescind his order for the use of American military forces?

Dulles questions whether Congress has such constitutional right to ask the President to rescind his order, or force him to do so; and Morse says the Resolution frightens him, from the standpoint of its constitutional implications.

Pg. 327. Senator Jackson asks Dulles if anyone in the legal department of State rendered an opinion on the power of the President, "*before you drafted the resolution.*" (This shows they knew who got up the "Eisenhower Resolution. It was Dulles).

Dulles says No.

SUPREME COURT BOWS TO COLD WAR

Fyke Farmer (and Peace) Turned Down.

The U.S. Supreme Court has turned down Mr. Farmer's appeal for a writ, in the case concerning his refusal to pay taxes for war.

It required the court a little longer than it did in the Rosenberg case—not not so very much longer. The Farmer brief ran to some 324 pages; and anyone who studied it knows that this able and brave man had the law on his side. To fight this case required outstanding courage and ability. Courage on the part of the court would also have been necessary, to sustain the revolutionary doctrine of the Nuremberg Law—especially in view of legislation now pending in Congress limiting the powers of the court to review. They did not have it. We all lose—the cause of peace in the world, and the court in general esteem.

In Hitler's time, it was finally established that whatever worked for the good of the Nazi Reich, was law. How far away from that are we today?

THREE BOOKS

On the cover of "The Big Brainwash" (Northern Book House, Toronto) is inscribed the prophet's accusation of ancient Israel: "For we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves."

It is a fitting text for the crusade of lies against the builders of socialism.

Dyson Carter gives a rapid-fire running account of this crusade, shuttling back and forth in time from the end of Czarism, the brave beginnings in the midst of capitalist invasion and civil war down to Sputnik and the era of Socialist Peace.

On each page he contrasts the stories we were told with the truth as it was. How red must be the faces of our news-editors! To be *so wrong so long!*

Carter has specialized in the field of chemistry but is thoroughly conversant with science in general, so that he is our fortunate guide to the multitudinous discoveries and inventions of Soviet scientists and engineers.

He quotes the stupid question of *US News*, "Why is it . . . all of a sudden Russia has a lot of scientists?" The question should be: Why is it *we have just found out* all of a sudden about Russia's scientists? Reason being simply the title of this book. Scientists don't spring up like mushrooms after a rain. He tells the story of education in the Stalin Era, the most amazing story since the life of Christ, actually the telescoping of history, packing centuries into decades, leaping in four decades from crass medievalism into modernity and on into the future. A thousand novels are in this book, whodunnits on every page, the drama of on-going man.

Carter's nervous staccatto style fits well the subject-matter.

We hear that the book is banned from the USA. *For some an overdose of truth !*

Scott and Helen Nearing in their "Socialists Around the World" compare the sequences and trends of the early 1930's, a dozen years after WW I with the sequences and trends of the late 1950's, a dozen years after WW II and come up with the same fearful prospect: WW III.

"The handwriting was on the wall before 1914. It was still clearer before 1939. In the spring of 1957 . . . the same contradictions, tensions, and conflict forces . . . and the same institutions . . . Yesterday, today, and tomorrow, like causes tend to produce like results.

The Nearlings faithfully record conversations with rank and file socialists in Britain, Holland, France, West Germany, Belgium, India, Scandinavia, and sad they were, reflecting the decline of the socialist movements everywhere, but saddest of all was North America where "socialists are under the harrow."

Socialists in Europe are confused, split, sometimes apathetic, satisfied with watered-down welfare-states, drifting, frequently co-operating in anti-communist coalitions. A Dutch socialist said

"The immediate demands of our Party have been largely won."

A Scandinavian comrade offered a possible explanation.

"In the days when my parents were active, many socialists were anti-clerical, anti-religious, and aetheist or agnostic. Through these various channels they turned their backs on all idealism except that which dealt with man's material needs. Indeed, many of the extremists insisted that man had no needs other than the physical ones. Today in Scandinavia the socialists are no longer anti anything. They are, in a limited sense, the leaders of our society, and since they have won their immediate demands and lost their vision and the enthusiasm which a splendid ideal engenders, they have ceased to lead. Instead, they drift idly and purposelessly with the masses."

The Nearings make no direct comment, but seem to share this man's disillusionment in a "socialism" which had reached its goal and was pretty dead. John Tunnicliffe has been preaching on this text for a long time. There is something lacking in a purely bread-oriented socialism. "Not by bread alone." But this tragedy of Western socialism, so dramatically presented here by the Nearings, is entirely absent from the Soviets and from China. For the Soviets and China are beginning an invasion of the whole world with friendly instruction and concrete assistence in economic and cultural progress. It is this invasion which galls Christendom, for it has taken over the substance of Christianity.

And in this fact is perhaps the *new element* in the "sequences and trends" of these late 1950's. The Nearings have given us a warm, informative, charmingly written story, extremely important to those who would understand the currents and deep streams of world events.

"The Portent of Milton" by E. H. Visiak (pub. T. Werner Laurie Ltd., London) will repay careful study.

Milton still lives though many (Chesterton, Belloc, Eliot and Pound) would gladly have buried him. Milton hated and fought royalism and clericalism. And he was hated in return. He was the great modern apostle of liberty. His views on divorce were far in advance of his time. "To him a rite was a rote . . . Church ritual was a tawdry materialism of supernal sublimities . . . "

Milton held office under Cromwell and pamphleteered magnificently during the Commonwealth and when it fell, barely escaped execution.

It is Visiak's thesis that in writing *Paradise Lost* Milton freed himself from the inner frustration which resulted from the Restoration, the defeat of twenty years heroic struggle, in pain, going blind, for a national ideal. Milton was a real mystic, open inwardly to the divine presence and saved by that presence alike from the dizziness of success and the depths of despair. He was integrated with his day, his people, the cosmic forward-influence. De Quincey called him "a power among powers" He belongs in the great company who fought for the conscience against the

cloth. Yet still today as in the not distant days of Victoria, in the words of Thomas Hardy

"Still rule those minds on earth
At whom sage Milton's wormwood words were hurled."

SOME BURNING QUESTIONS FOR U.S.

By Judge Edward P. Totten

Our great country is facing a challenge such as it has never encountered in its history. Our people are confronted with issues of such import as may well determine the question of our survival. Some in the best position to know tell us that, while we are squandering unimaginable billions on bombs, planes and missiles, the real challenge to our position is not in the military but in the economic field, and in the race to win the minds of men.

Recently the leaders of the Soviet Union announced that they are summoning us to a contest in the field of production in which, with some reason, we have been regarding ourselves as supreme. Yet, with the American economy receding eleven per cent in the first quarter of 1958 while the Russian economy advanced in an equal percentage, as reported by Allen Dulles of Central Intelligence Agency, perhaps we should begin to "look to our laurels."

If the largest so-called "peace-time" military expenditures in the world's history are not sufficient to sustain capacity production and full employment in our country, we may rest assured that some searching questions are being asked and answers sought by many new nations recently emerging from colonial imperialism. They are reported to be seriously inquiring: "Is the great United States, in complete disregard of the truth of the world situation, caught in a compulsive drive to continue the "cold war" in an attempt to make viable an economy no longer able to maintain itself on its own base?" In an August, 1950, issue of "U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT" there appeared the following statement.

> "The Korean war is really a made-to-order situation to keep business on a high level. It lays the ghost of the depression that has been haunting business in the United States since the end of the second world war."

In the January 23rd issue of "THE LOS ANGELES TIMES" (1952) its regular corresjondent Holmes Alexander wrote:

> "The cause-and-effect relationship between foreign policy and domestic prosperity is there for all to see. The 104,000 casualties in Korea are one reason we have a full employment figure of 61,000,000 . . . There's a well-told tale of our current prosperity. If you don't count the corpses and the National debt, power politics has paid off big. If you don't mind inflation and Government controls, a war economy is much better than a peace economy."

"The Journal of Commerce", New York, of July 14th, 1952, headed an editorial "Business Needs Defense Spending" and then said:

"The assurance of a continued high level of defense expenditures under present conditions cannot be overestimated, because the whole economy pivots around it. The fact of the matter is that it currently takes defense expenditures of about Fifty Billion Dollars annually just to hold the current level of business activity. Actually, nothing but the present gigantic defense program would have successfully filled the "air-pocket" in the civilian sector of the economy. The records show that for the past 15 months it has taken greater and greater defence expenditures just to hold business on an even keel. In plain words, we hod to run faster just to stand still."

Adding his testimony to the same effect, in a comment on current conditions, INS Economist M. K. Rukeyser, in "The Los Angeles Examiner" of January 5th, 1955, headed his article:

"Cold War Plays Major Role in U. S. Economy."

Can it be denied that during the nearly thirty years since the "stock market crash" of 1929, the American economy has functioned at capacity with full employment only during the times we have been preparing for war or activity engaged in war?

To minds unblinded by prejudice or passion it is becoming clearer every day that what is actually being called in question by our rivals for world leadership is the ability of our system of capitalist production to operate in the long term without resorting to war for the control of natural resources and markets. It is far from pleasant that a chorus of voices is rising in the world earnestly inquiring whether war is a necessary concomitant of a capitalist civilization. All of which gives rise to the question whether we can really afford Peace at the risk of a disastrous collapse of our economy.

How we proceed in the immediate future to meet this momentous issue will undoubtedly determine the direction in which the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa will move. Is it true, as many Americans urge, that we are already on the losing side in the struggle for the minds of men? It is submitted that to brush off as "propaganda" every proposal of the Socialist world for peaceful co-existence does not frankly meet the situation when an eminent British statesman could recently say: "America is hag-ridden by the fear of Peace."

Born in a revolution in the 18th century, America is missing its opportunity of leadership in the world-wide revolutions of the 20th. During the past decisive decade, many world-observers tell us, we have been too often recognized as staunch supporters of the status quo while people have been rising against their feudal rulers and demanding their place in the sun. Instead of an imaginative leadership toward peace an dco-operation with the new forces, we are apparently satisfied with the direction of our affairs by old men who mistake a sterile "anti-Communism" for a comprehensive policy to deal with the dynamic situation of a rapidly-changing world. A prophet once truly said: "Where there is no vision the people perish!"

NEW CHRISTIAN

JULY - OCT. 1958

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I. Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etianne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**